

REMARKS

Claims 78 - 99 were previously presented and are pending in the Application. Claims 1 - 77 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 78 – 99 are pending in the application.

Claims 78 – 99 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,890,167 (hereinafter Bridge) in view of US 2004/0034515 (hereinafter Thom). The rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

CLAIM 78

Claim 78 recites:

A method comprising:
receiving, from a user, input that selects a plurality of database **objects to be transported from a source database to a target database**, wherein the plurality of database objects includes at least one of:
a view,
a sequence,
a dimension,
a cube,
an ETL mapping,
a queue,
an external table,
a stored procedure, or
a database object, wherein the metadata for the database object is stored outside of the source database and the target database;
reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database;
storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database; and
based on the meta-metadata, performing operations to transport the selected objects to the target database.

Claim 78 provides an advantageous method for transporting selected objects from a source database to a target database. According to Claim 78, from a user, input is received that selects a plurality of database objects to be transported from a source database to a target database. Metadata is read about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database. Meta-metadata is stored, the meta-metadata indicating the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database. Finally, based on the meta-metadata, operations are performed to transport the selected objects to the target database. Such a method is neither disclosed nor suggested by Bridge.

Bridge transports table data by transporting specific kinds of database objects that are tablespaces. The entire tablespace is unplugged from a source database system and unplugged into a target database system. (col. 6, lines 52 – 55, col. 7, lines 8 – 11)

Bridge explains, “groups of related datafiles are collected into tablespaces.” (column 6, lines 39-40) A tablespace is a collection of data files. (col. 6 lines 42-43) An object, or data item, is located within a database and stored within one or more data files and one or more tablespaces. (col. 3, lines 55-64; col. 4, lines 40-44) In Bridge, tablespaces and corresponding metadata are transported. (col. 10, lines 52-57; column 4, lines 44-60; col. 6, lines 58-60)

A fundamental difference between Bridge and claim 78 is that in Bridge, only tablespaces maybe selected for transport and only the entire tablespace is transported, while in Claim 78, specific objects are selected to be transported, without requiring the entire tablespace be transported. In Bridge, an entire tablespace is selected when a “user ‘unplugs’ a set of tablespaces...containing the desired data.” (col. 6, lines 52 – 55) “The user may then ‘plug’ the set of tablespaces into a target database by issuing a plug-in

command....” (col. 7, lines 8 – 11) Bridge fails to disclose in any way selecting specific objects to be transported, without requiring the entire tablespace to be transported.

Another fundamental difference is that claim 78 requires meta-metadata. Meta-metadata “indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database.” Bridge does teach about “metadata”. In Bridge, “Metadata is information about data in a database, such as data dictionary information about what tables are in the database, what columns a table has, what indexes have been built for a table, and so forth. Metadata describes objects in the database, and these objects may contain disk pointers.” (column 3, lines 51 - 55). However, metadata in Bridge fails to “indicate... the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database,” as does the meta-metadata of claim 78. The metadata of Bridge is not the meta-metadata of claim 78.

If Bridge fails to teach meta-metadata, it must fail to teach the various ways meta-metadata is processed under claim 78. Bridge thus fails to teach “storing **meta-metadata** that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database,” and fails to teach “reading **meta-metadata** about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database.”

Despite alleging that Bridge does not substantially differ from claim 78, the Examiner relies on Thom for teaching the above highlighted features of claim 78. However, Thom fails to suggest in any way much less disclose these features of claim 78.

On a fundamental level, Thom is not addressed to transporting database objects. Rather, it describes approaches for translating and mapping data from an originating database presentation, or in an originating format, to data in a target database presentation, or target format. (0013, 0051]) The originating database may be, for example, a relational database that stores more detailed information, and an OLAP

database, which stores precomputed and/or reorganized information from the relational database system. (0005 – 0009) The translating and mappings is used to support OLAP functions such as drill-down, in which a user may access more detailed information about an item “by accessing information starting with a general category and moving through a hierarchy to obtain specific information relating to the general category.” (0055).

Clearly, an OLAP database system involves transferring data (or data computed there from) that is stored in database objects (e.g. table) of a relational database to an OLAP system. However, there is no discussion that database objects themselves are transported between database systems, as claim 78 requires, much less a discussion about **meta-metadata** that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database, as claimed.

The Office Action cites passage 0009 as “teaching reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database; storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database; and based on the meta-metadata, performing operations to transport the selected objects to the target database.” However, such teachings are conspicuously absent from this passage. The passage is reproduced below.

One drawback to the OLAP approach is that if a user requires a database result that has not been pre-computed then the system must generate the result from items in the relational database. Another is that the size of an OLAP database is exponentially proportional to the number of items it holds data for, frequently making storage of detailed information impractical. The result is that OLAP and Relational technologies are complimentary and there is a strong motivation to allow navigation back and forth, based on the business question that needs answering. However, a problem arises in “mapping” user views of data in OLAP with items of data in a relational database. Often, the higher-level of presentation in an OLAP user interface does not map directly to the base items that were used to generate the OLAP presentation. For example, at the OLAP level the user might view a list of “promotional sales” by “product brands” in 2001. The user may then request to view a list of promotional sales for individual products. The

OLAP interface will attempt to fulfill the user's request only to discover that it doesn't store data on individual products....

Perhaps this citation is an oversight. If so, further clarification is requested.

Nevertheless, Applicant has reviewed Thom and has not found any disclosure much less a suggestion about the above highlighted features of claim 78.

Based on the foregoing, Bridge and Thom, alone or in combination, fail to suggest in any way much less disclose all the limitations of claim 78. Therefore claim 78 is patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 78 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 86

Claim 86 recites, in part:

reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in which to
transport the selected objects to the target database;
storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected
objects to the target database.

Claim 86 requires "meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database." Therefore, claim 86 is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to new claim 78. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 86 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 94

Claim 94 recites, in part:

receiving, at a target database, meta-metadata that indicates a manner in which to
transport selected objects from a source database to the target database;

based on the meta-metadata, performing operations to transport the selected objects to the target database.

Claim 94 also requires “meta-metadata that indicates a manner in which to transport selected objects from a source database to the target database” For reasons similar to those discussed in connection with new claim 78, Claim 94 is allowable.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Dependent claims 79, 87 and 95 recite:

in response to a failure occurring during the transport of any of the selected objects to the target database, rolling back all changes made during the transport of the selected objects to the target database.

Rolling back a database-to-database transport of user selected objects is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references. This feature is not suggested in any way much less disclosed by the cited art.

The Office Action only relies on a specific passage in Thom, which is reproduced below.

Because UDS uses existing query tools and reports as the starting and end-points, the user perceives UDS as a transparent bridge between the originating and target reports and the tools that are used to present them. Advantageously, UDS imposes no restrictions on what can be done in the originating report and does not restrict what can be done with the target report after completion of a drill-through transaction. The changes that have been applied have used the query specification of the target report tool, so the target report is in no way different than if the user had created the report using the user interface of the target client query tools. (0066)

Conspicuously, there is nothing in this passage that suggests in any way much less discloses a roll back operation, much less one for rolling back all changes made during the transport of the selected objects to the target database.

Remaining Claims

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims includes the limitations of claims upon which it depends, each of the dependant claims is patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which each dependant claim depends is patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: January 24, 2008

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 544
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone No.: (402) 408-1080 ext.206
Facsimile No.: (402) 408-1076

/MarcelKBingham#42327/

Marcel K. Bingham
Reg. No. 42,327